



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/875,546	06/05/2001	Dan Kikinis	007287.00046	6897
22907 7590 05/12/2009 BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. 1100 13th STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051				
EXAMINER				
SALCE, JASON P				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2421				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/12/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Continuation of Item 11 from Advisory

In regards to the 112 1st Paragraph rejections, Applicant argues that claim 2 of the original specification provides support for the currently claimed limitation, **"wherein the computing device is configured to display at least a portion of the EPG on the second display while the video display is concurrently displaying at least a portion of the EPG"**.

The examiner disagrees and notes that original claims 1 and 2 differ in scope from the currently amended claim 1 of the instant application. For example, original claim 1 states **"a computing device coupled with"**, as opposed to the currently claimed **"a computing device configured to"**. Further, original claim 2 states, **"wherein the video display can display a portion of the EPG concurrently displayed on the second display of the computing device"**, while the currently presented claim state, **"wherein the computing device is configured to display at least a portion of the EPG on the second display while the video display is concurrently displaying at least a portion of the EPG"**. As shown, both claims differ in scope and therefore the original disclosure of the specification cannot be used to support the currently amended claims. The Examiner further notes that the difference in scope resides from the current claims recite coverage for more (**broaden in scope**) than the original claims. Original claim 2 simply states, **"wherein the video display can display a portion of the EPG concurrently displayed on the second display of the computing device"**. As stated, the second display is displaying the entire EPG while

the video display is only displaying a portion. In contrast the currently amended claim 1 states, “**wherein the computing device is configured to display at least a portion of the EPG on the second display while the video display is concurrently displaying at least a portion of the EPG**”. Clearly this presents additional coverage for the second display where previously the entire EPG was displayed (**while only a portion of the EPG is displayed on the video display**) and now the second display is capable of displaying the entire EPG or only a portion, therefore presenting a scope change from the original disclosure of Applicant's specification.

Applicant also notes that the original claims, in combination with the remaining original disclosure clearly provide support for the currently amended claims, however, Applicant's statement is purely speculative and the Examiner (**after examining the original disclosure numerous times in the previous responses to Applicant in defense of the 112 1st Paragraph rejection**) has not found support for the presently amended claims.

In regards to the 102 rejections in view of Grooters, Applicant argues that Grooters fails to teach displaying portions of the EPG on the two displays concurrently. The Examiner disagrees and notes that Column 7, Lines 24-27 clearly states that display 226 is used to display a portion of EPG 214. Further, while display 226 is displaying a portion of EPG 214 and the user highlights a time slot or channel on the portion of EPG 214 displayed on display 226 (**Column 7, Lines 27-31**), the **PROGRAM GUIDE DATA 214 corresponding to the highlighted time slot or channel (which**

Art Unit: 2421

clearly represents a SECOND PORTION of an EPG) may be transmitted to second information handling system 218 and displayed on a display 228, rather than

display 226, which has been noted as displaying a first portion of the EPG.

/Jason P Salce/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2421

5/10/2009